

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

ANGELICA CLARK, et al.	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Case No. 3:20-cv-01436-IM
	)	
v.	)	
	)	January 12, 2022
CHAD WOLF, Acting Secretary	)	
United States Department of	)	
Homeland Security, et al.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE  
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE KARIN J. IMMERGUT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S) : DAVID D. PARK  
Elliott & Park, PC  
0324 S Abernethy Street  
Portland, OR 97239

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S) : DAVID F. SUGERMAN  
Sugerman Law Office  
707 SW Washington Street  
Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S) : MICHELLE R. BURROWS  
Michelle R. Burrows, PC  
1333 NE Orenco Station Pkwy  
Suite 525  
Hillsboro, OR 97124

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S) : NADIA H. DAHAB  
Sugerman Law Office  
707 SW Washington Street  
Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205

FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S) : JANE L. MOISAN  
People's Law Project  
818 SW 4th Avenue  
# 221-3789  
Portland, OR 97204

FOR THE DEFENDANT(S) :  
GLENN GREENE  
DOJ-Civ  
P.O. Box 7146  
Washington, DC 20044

FOR DHS and THE MARSHALS SERVICE: MICHAEL P. CLENDENEN  
Trial Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20530

COURT REPORTER: Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC  
United States District Courthouse  
1000 SW Third Avenue, Room 301  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503)326-8191

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(January 12, 2022)

(Telephonic oral argument:)

DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: This United States District Court is now in session. The Honorable Karin J. Immergut presiding.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. We're here on the record in Clark, et al. v. Chad Wolf, et al. Case 20-cv-01436. This was the time set by the Court for oral argument on motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Burger, Cline, Jones, Morgan, Russell, and Smith.

Counsel, I'm going to have you state your appearances for the record.

First, I'll start with plaintiffs' counsel. Do we have David Park?

MR. PARK: Yes, Your Honor. David Park appearing for plaintiff.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Park, who is speaking on behalf of plaintiffs today?

MR. PARK: Nadia Dahab.

THE COURT: Perfect.

And then we have -- I'm just doing it in the order that you're listed -- Jane Moisan.

MS. MOISAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jane Moisan for plaintiff.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 And Michelle Burrows?

3 MS. BURROWS: Yes, Your Honor. I'm here.

4 THE COURT: And Nadia Dahab?

5 MS. DAHAB: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Good morning.

7 And then for -- Ms. Dahab, did I get everybody who is  
8 supposed to be on the record?

9 MS. DAHAB: I think we also have David Sugerman on  
10 the phone with us this morning.

11 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sugerman, are you there?

12 MR. SUGERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.

13 Appearing by phone and muting.

14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

15 And, Ms. Dahab, can -- are you able to see and hear me  
16 okay?

17 MS. DAHAB: Yes, I am. Thank you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

19 And then for defense, do we have Glenn Greene?

20 MR. GREENE: Good morning, Your Honor. Glenn Greene  
21 on behalf of the six individual capacity defendants.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 And Michael Clendenen?

24 MR. CLENDENEN: Good morning, Your Honor.

25 Mike Clendenen here for the United States.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And same for -- I  
2 know -- Mr. Clendenen, I think you're going to argue the  
3 discovery motion, and Mr. Greene will argue the motion to  
4 dismiss; is that correct?

5 MR. CLENDENEN: Yes, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: So if at any time folks can't hear, do  
7 wave and get my attention. I know sometimes we seem to lose  
8 connection. Hopefully that won't happen.

9 I thought I would first start by telling you just what my  
10 plan is for today's hearing. I did want to start by addressing  
11 the defendants' motion to dismiss brought by the supervisory  
12 agents, and then I'll go to the motion to compel discovery, and  
13 then I would like to just discuss generally, I suppose, the  
14 status of the case and the status of service, who has been --  
15 has anyone else been served, et cetera, and just where the case  
16 is going.

17 So I think for the -- probably it's most helpful if you  
18 have what my inclination is for the motion to dismiss brought.  
19 Obviously, this complaint is brought under *Bivens* on behalf of  
20 those who were allegedly detained without probable cause and  
21 subjected to excessive force while in the protest zone in  
22 downtown Portland between July 1, 2020, and July 30, 2020.  
23 That's the allegation.

24 It is my inclination that the supervisory defendants who  
25 are bringing this motion to dismiss are in a similar position

1 to the prior defendants -- Chad Wolf and Ken Cuccinelli.  
2 They -- and that it would be -- my inclination is that the case  
3 against them should be dismissed because it stretches the  
4 implied cause of action under *Bivens* outside of the context in  
5 which it was intended, which the Supreme Court has cautioned  
6 against, and for the same rationale I dismissed the others,  
7 it's my inclination that the same result should happen here.

8 So I think the focus, probably, Ms. Dahab, for you is --  
9 and I'll hear both why I'm wrong, from your perspective, and  
10 why Mr. Greene thinks I'm right, I suppose. If you could start  
11 by -- let me ask you a couple of things that would be helpful  
12 to frame your argument, and of course I'll hear -- I'm just  
13 saying that's my inclination based on my review of all your  
14 pleadings and the record. But it would be helpful to me if you  
15 would walk through concretely in the complaint the direct  
16 relationship between any of these named defendants and the  
17 specific actions you allege, particularly with regard to the  
18 named plaintiffs, and I'm still struggling a little bit in this  
19 case because it's alleged as a class. Obviously, we have made  
20 no determination about whether a class is appropriate or  
21 whether even a class is possible for the pure gap under *Bivens*,  
22 but that's presumably for a later time.

23 But certainly *Bivens* requires that -- or doesn't allow  
24 claims based on vicarious liability or respondeat superior, but  
25 there has to be direct involvement of these particular

1 defendants. So if you could focus your argument really on that  
2 piece of it, that would be very helpful.

3 The second is with regard to the argument that the  
4 defendants make in their briefing, that really this is a  
5 challenge to a government policy and, you know, does the  
6 government get to use the munitions that they used that you are  
7 alleging are part of the excessive force and whether tear gas  
8 constitutes an arrest. Those are all issues that seem to go --  
9 at least defendants argue those would go to policies that are  
10 not appropriate for *Bivens* to apply in that context. That is  
11 not an appropriate context in which *Bivens* can be applied and  
12 has been -- that's really something for Congress and the  
13 Executive Branch -- but not the Courts -- to weigh in on. So I  
14 would like you to address that.

15 So those are really some of the main issues I would like  
16 you to focus on, but I'll allow you to raise anything you would  
17 like to supplement your briefing. Obviously, your briefing is  
18 very thorough. So you don't need to repeat everything in your  
19 brief. I have read it and -- I've read it also similar --  
20 obviously, we've heard these arguments before in the last  
21 briefing too. So I'm pretty familiar with the arguments. But  
22 anything you can address to -- or say to address my concerns --

23 MS. DAHAB: Great. Thank you for that guidance,  
24 Your Honor.

25 Am I starting here or is Mr. Greene starting?

1 THE COURT: Well, I actually thought since I'm going  
2 to --

3 MS. DAHAB: You just asked me all those questions.

4 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to let you go first, and  
5 then I'll allow Mr. Greene to respond. And then I'll only just  
6 have the one time each.

7 So this is your shot to address my concerns. I might have  
8 a couple of additional questions as we go through, but I wanted  
9 to tee up for you what -- as I went through the briefing,  
10 what -- the defendants' briefing -- what my concerns were, but  
11 I thought that just to manage the time better, that it would be  
12 better for you to go first.

13 MS. DAHAB: Understood.

14 THE COURT: And then rather than giving the  
15 government two shots, I would just have the government give me  
16 their best argument last.

17 MS. DAHAB: Great. Okay. Perfect. Thank you for  
18 that.

19 I will do my best not to repeat what we have laid out in  
20 the briefing, understanding that Your Honor has read this  
21 briefing or similar briefing twice already; but as the Court  
22 knows, under the *Bivens* analysis or the *Abbasi* analysis, this  
23 Court has to consider whether, as defendants allege, this is a  
24 new context within the meaning of *Bivens* that would expand the  
25 scope of *Bivens*.



1        *Bivens*, of course, is a Fourth Amendment case wherein  
2 federal narcotics agents were, you know, alleged to have used  
3 unconstitutional force in a search and seizure of an  
4 individual.

5        In plaintiffs' view -- and I think this is clear from our  
6 briefing -- that's the circumstance that we also have here.

7        To be sure, this motion is brought by supervisory-level  
8 officers of, I think, different levels within the chain of  
9 command that was operating as part of Operation Diligent Valor  
10 in July of 2020.

11        I will start -- I think it's probably easiest to start  
12 with the complaint, as Your Honor requested, to kind of walk  
13 through the specific allegations of the complaint that, in our  
14 view, go to these supervisory-level officers.

15        I think, generally, we describe, at least in the -- sort  
16 of the introductory paragraph, the identities of these  
17 supervisory-level defendants and sort of generally what their  
18 roles were within the implementation of Operation Diligent  
19 Valor.

20        So if the Court looks to paragraphs 25 through 30 of the  
21 second amended class-action complaint, that's where we specify,  
22 based on information that we learned from Mr. Clendenen,  
23 primarily, over -- or, I guess, we -- we have supplemented this  
24 with information we learned from Mr. Clendenen, based on what  
25 those individuals were doing over the course of Operation

1 Diligent Valor and what sort of direction and control they  
2 have -- or they had over the individuals on the ground here in  
3 Portland.

4 THE COURT: Let me ask you about that, Ms. Dahab, and  
5 I think the defendants make this argument somewhat in their  
6 briefs. You don't dispute that there was a lot of violence and  
7 destruction happening in Portland during these very same  
8 protests, do you?

9 MS. DAHAB: No, we don't dispute that.

10 THE COURT: You don't dispute that it was legitimate  
11 for the agency or supervisors to be at least responding to that  
12 force and making sure that there were tactical decisions to  
13 protect the Hatfield Courthouse and the area -- surrounding  
14 area, do you?

15 MS. DAHAB: No, we don't dispute that.

16 I think our position, though, at least in that respect, is  
17 that these individuals had the authority to respond to those --  
18 to acts of violence against both the property and the officers.

19 The Constitution, and specifically the Fourth Amendment,  
20 doesn't allow them to -- or requires that response to be  
21 individualized. So it does not allow them to use broad force  
22 against everyone in the crowd, and it does not permit them to  
23 use any force against nonviolent or otherwise peacefully  
24 protesting individuals, of which we -- of which there were  
25 many.

1 THE COURT: So tell me what is -- this is going  
2 perhaps far afield from the actual complaint, but it -- but it  
3 does crop up in my mind as I review the case. What would be  
4 reasonable if you had a crowd that is climbing the fence,  
5 trying to write on the building, trying to break in the  
6 building, and there are many people doing it? And even though  
7 there are many, presumably, innocent protesters in the vicinity  
8 as well? When you say "targeted," should they be shot with  
9 munitions bullets? That seems like -- the rubber bullets is  
10 also conduct that is challenged. So what is the response that  
11 plaintiffs think should have happened?

12 MS. DAHAB: Sure. I suppose, by "targeted," I'm not  
13 sure I intended to say "individualized." So the response needs  
14 to be directed at the violent or otherwise aggressive  
15 protesters. Whether, you know -- I think it --

16 THE COURT: How do you individualize when there's a  
17 crowd essentially swarming and then there's some innocent folks  
18 there too?

19 MS. DAHAB: Sure. I'm not sure. I will say I don't  
20 think those are the facts that are alleged in the complaint.

21 I think the officers certainly are given some discretion  
22 on the ground, in terms of the amount of force that would be  
23 reasonable in the circumstances. I don't think they're  
24 allowed -- I don't think use of deadly force -- and in some  
25 circumstances the force here was potentially deadly force -- is

1 reasonable in any of those circumstances, unless there is a  
2 direct threat to the officers' safety as opposed to the  
3 property -- you know, the -- the safety of the property itself.

4 THE COURT: So in --

5 MS. DAHAB: I think -- go ahead.

6 THE COURT: In plaintiffs' view, any less lethal than  
7 tear gas to -- just assuming, for the sake of argument, there  
8 are groups engaged in violent or destructive conduct --  
9 climbing the fence, breaking windows, shooting -- we have seen  
10 a lot about what defendants say happened -- assuming, for the  
11 sake of argument, those things are occurring among several  
12 people in the crowd, what is less lethal or dangerous than tear  
13 gas? In plaintiffs' view, what should they have used instead  
14 of tear gas?

15 MS. DAHAB: You know, I think there are probably ways  
16 for the officers to use nondispersed force. You know,  
17 direct -- directly, sort of, cabining the protesters. I don't  
18 know that there -- you know, the -- the other uses of force,  
19 being munitions that they used here, are certainly not the  
20 not-less-lethal.

21 THE COURT: But how do you cabin protesters who are  
22 engaging in that kind of conduct? What is plaintiffs' -- I  
23 mean, does plaintiff have an alternative to the type of force  
24 that you are alleging was unlawful?

25 MS. DAHAB: I mean, at least on the facts alleged in

1 this case, Your Honor, I think -- you know, particularly with  
2 respect to many of the plaintiffs who were not violent, many of  
3 whom were following dispersal orders -- and I think that was  
4 the case for many class members as well -- that no force should  
5 have been used, that tear gas was -- was unreasonable because  
6 those protesters were not engaging in aggressive acts. They  
7 were nonviolently protesting and exercising their right to do  
8 that and were lawfully following dispersal orders that the  
9 officer had -- that the officers had issued.

10 So our position is, at least as to those individuals,  
11 there was no -- there should not have been any use of force.

12 THE COURT: How would they avoid -- again, there are  
13 not very many claims in your complaint that say even the  
14 plaintiffs were targeted with tear gas. You say some other  
15 munitions specifically targeted. But with tear gas, assuming  
16 they were bystanders there, do you have -- or officers -- is  
17 there any way to avoid tear gas affecting innocent plaintiffs,  
18 for example, if they're in the crowd and there are others who  
19 it's appropriate to use tear gas? I mean, how do you avoid  
20 that?

21 MS. DAHAB: I'm not sure how you avoid it. Frankly,  
22 I don't know how you avoid that. I don't want to concede that  
23 tear gas would have been a -- particularly in a pandemic, would  
24 have been a reasonable use of force under any circumstances  
25 here. And there may have been ways to, like I said, handle the

1 protesters, at least the violent protesters, individually,  
2 without having to resort to tear gas at all.

3 THE COURT: All right. So I know I'm asking you  
4 questions that go beyond really what the purpose of this is,  
5 but I don't get to see you very much in the context of a  
6 hearing here.

7 MS. DAHAB: Sure.

8 THE COURT: So I think that is something that just I  
9 wanted to talk about.

10 MS. DAHAB: No, I appreciate that. I think it's -- I  
11 know Your Honor is very cognizant of this, and I just want to  
12 make clear, though, that the allegations of the complaint are  
13 such that, you know, the class that we're seeking -- or the  
14 plaintiffs and the class that we may eventually seek to  
15 represent are nonviolent and otherwise peacefully protesting  
16 individuals who were following at least the dispersal orders  
17 that were issued.

18 As I say that out loud, I'm thinking that there are  
19 allegations also as to the -- in this complaint about the  
20 office -- the officials' failure to issue dispersal orders, in  
21 the first instance, on many of these nights; and that, I think,  
22 is one predicate step in response to Your Honor's questions  
23 about what -- how officers should have responded even to  
24 violent protesters. The first thing that they should have done  
25 is issued a dispersal order on many of these nights, and they

1 failed to do that.

2 But I think the allegations of this complaint are  
3 different than the circumstances that Your Honor is describing,  
4 and these allegations, particularly when you construe them in  
5 favor of plaintiffs, are such that I think -- I think this is  
6 getting to the qualified immunity question, which you didn't  
7 ask me to focus on, but are such that there was an excessive  
8 use of force here, that as -- getting us back on track here --  
9 that we think squarely falls within the ambit of *Bivens*.

10 I was going through the complaint, and we were looking at  
11 paragraph 25 through 30, which described generally the roles of  
12 each of these supervisory officers. Some of them were in  
13 Washington and some of them were here in Portland, and  
14 plaintiffs understand that.

15 If the Court turns, then, to -- I don't want to skip  
16 important allegations here -- to paragraph -- and I will say  
17 that the -- the complaint refers both to Doe -- John Doe  
18 supervisory defendants and John Doe patrol-level defendants, as  
19 well as all supervisory defendants. And in plaintiff's view,  
20 the allegations referring to all supervisory defendants include  
21 the six supervisory defendants that have moved -- that have  
22 filed a motion here.

23 So paragraph 4, again, generally --

24 THE COURT: Actually, let me ask you about that,  
25 Ms. Dahab. The defendants make the point, and I think it's

1 well taken, that under *Bivens* -- a blanket allegation that  
2 doesn't specify individual conduct is insufficient under  
3 *Bivens*. Is that wrong?

4 MS. DAHAB: I think it -- I mean, I don't -- by  
5 referring to all supervisory defendants, I don't think that's a  
6 blanket allegation that doesn't refer to specific conduct. The  
7 allegations referring to all supervisory defendants contain, I  
8 think, sufficiently specific information about the conduct of  
9 those supervisory defendants to satisfy *Bivens*.

10 I think, sure, there's a level of generality that may be  
11 insufficient, some of the cases acknowledge, but I don't think  
12 we have that here, and I don't think that just simply referring  
13 to all supervisory defendants necessarily makes the allegation  
14 itself. I don't know that I can specify the standard under  
15 *Bivens*.

16 43, I think, starts a series of allegations about all  
17 supervisory defendants and the fact that they were acting under  
18 color of law, that they are not named herein -- some of them  
19 are not named herein, and that all of those agents had  
20 oversight or administrative authority or were specifically  
21 dispatched to or stationed here in Portland.

22 I'm then going to skip the class action allegations and  
23 turn to paragraph 60. My apologies in advance for jumping all  
24 over, but I think paragraph 60 is where we start -- start  
25 setting forth particular allegations of conduct that both the



1 supervisory defendants and the patrol-level defendants engaged  
2 in with respect to use of force against nonviolent or  
3 peacefully protesting individuals during -- in the protest  
4 zone.

5 Those allegations include, for instance, escalating the  
6 violence on a nightly basis; failing to deescalate the  
7 strategy -- their tactics -- to mitigate the violence;  
8 targeting peacefully and lawfully dispersing individuals;  
9 pursuing protesters, observers, and journalists throughout the  
10 streets; and also firing some of the munitions that we describe  
11 in later paragraphs of the complaint.

12 Paragraph 61 describes that the officers built the fence  
13 and fired from the fence and also sometimes from higher floors  
14 above the ground level at the courthouse at the direction of  
15 the supervisory officers.

16 And then I think the paragraphs from -- from 65 and 66  
17 also talk about the specific use of force by those supervisory-  
18 and patrol-level defendants.

19 THE COURT: And so which defendants -- so you have  
20 five -- six defendants named here. So, for example, you are  
21 alleging that by actually building the fence, that subjects  
22 them to a *Bivens* personal liability? And which one is  
23 responsible for that?

24 MS. DAHAB: No. I'm saying that they built the fence  
25 or somebody told them to build the fence and the fact that

1 they're firing munitions from inside the fence and from floors  
2 above the ground level, at the direction of the supervisory  
3 defendants, is what gives rise to the *Bivens* liability, not the  
4 construction of the fence itself.

5 THE COURT: So the fence is not part of -- you're not  
6 alleging that the -- what is the purpose of the statement about  
7 the fence?

8 MS. DAHAB: I mean, I think the fence is relevant,  
9 Your Honor, to the extent that the officers are protected by  
10 the fence, and they're -- it put them in a place of safety  
11 from -- from otherwise violent protesters that may have been  
12 there, but I think that lessened their -- the reasonableness of  
13 their use of force against the protesters.

14 THE COURT: Understood. Thank you.

15 MS. DAHAB: And then I'm going to skip to  
16 paragraphs 70 through 76, which addressed, specifically,  
17 supervisory liability.

18 I think the prior paragraphs obviously provide context for  
19 what was happening, who was doing what, and the nature of the  
20 force used on the protesters.

21 72 and 73 describe more specifically what these six  
22 defendants were doing, which is to say that Defendants Russell,  
23 Smith, and Jones were manning the incident command post within  
24 the courthouse itself, watching the actions outside on live  
25 feed video, while Morgan -- Morgan, Burger, Cuccinelli, and

1 Wolf -- who are no longer part of the case -- otherwise had  
2 knowledge, under paragraph 73, that all this was going on on a  
3 nightly basis.

4 THE COURT: Although, does that show, again directly,  
5 that they would have seen any of the specific targeting that  
6 you allege happened to any of these named plaintiffs?

7 MS. DAHAB: We allege in paragraph 76 that the  
8 supervisory defendants knew of, either in real time or within a  
9 day of it happening, every single one of these incidents  
10 between (a) and just to (ff) of the complaint. I don't know  
11 that we allege that they saw it -- each one of those happening.

12 The people that were inside the Hatfield Courthouse,  
13 watching on a live feed video, very well could have. I don't  
14 think we have enough information, and we hope to get that sort  
15 of information in discovery in this case. We don't have that  
16 specific level of information, but we allege that they knew  
17 that the -- all of those incidents happened either at the time  
18 that they happened or shortly thereafter.

19 THE COURT: And what do you allege that shows they  
20 participated in it? Which aspect of the complaint shows that?

21 MS. DAHAB: I think these paragraphs show  
22 participation. I think under a standard set forth in *Starr v.*  
23 *Baca* and in *Chavez v. United States*, we have to allege either  
24 direct participation or information sufficient for these  
25 supervisory-level -- supervisory-level officers to know what

1 was happening and not do anything about it.

2 So I don't think the standard requires us to allege that  
3 they were shooting munitions themselves but that they had  
4 enough information to know that that was happening and didn't  
5 take affirmative steps to stop the -- the constitutional  
6 violations that were occurring.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MS. DAHAB: In plaintiffs' view, these allegations,  
9 in particular 73 to 76, are where we meet that standard.

10 All of this -- all of those allegations, Your Honor, are  
11 very much focused on the use of force by the officers on the  
12 ground against the protesters. They do not seek to challenge  
13 the executive order that led to the -- that led to the  
14 stationing of those officers in Portland to protect the  
15 Hatfield Courthouse.

16 I think that is a -- we tried to make that more clear in  
17 our briefing on this -- on the second round. I think it -- in  
18 many ways that distinguishes these six officers whose motion  
19 currently is before the Court from Defendants Wolf and  
20 Cuccinelli, who truly are -- who were -- I don't want to  
21 concede anything as to Wolf and Cuccinelli, but they were, you  
22 know, political appointees who were high -- who were at the  
23 highest level making the policy decisions and implementing the  
24 policies at the direction of the President.

25 These officers, I think, are differently situated, in the

1 sense that they are not -- not making the policy decisions. We  
2 are not challenging those policy decisions. They are on the  
3 ground, watching excessive uses of force occur as they occur  
4 and not taking steps to prevent it, and I don't think anybody  
5 argues here that those uses of force were contemplated by the  
6 policy that they were -- that were -- that they were stationed  
7 to carry out.

8 All of that, I think, squarely puts this case in the  
9 context of *Bivens* and doesn't require an expansion of *Bivens*  
10 for this Court to allow this cause of action against the  
11 officers.

12 *Abbasi* makes clear, I think, that that case -- you know,  
13 the defendants' motion cites a lot of statements from *Abbasi*  
14 that casts doubt on the validity of *Bivens*. *Abbasi* makes very  
15 clear that it was not intended to do that and that *Bivens*, as a  
16 fixed principle of law and a principle on which litigants have  
17 relied for decades, still exists.

18 I don't think this is a new context because we have --  
19 again, as I have just described, we have those specific uses of  
20 force. We have the Fourth Amendment context in which *Bivens*  
21 arose and federal officers engaging in excessive uses of  
22 forces -- force or unlawful searches and seizures against  
23 individuals.

24 I think *Abbasi* itself contemplates that the fact that  
25 these are supervisory-level officers, as opposed to

1 patrol-level officers, does not make this a new context. One  
2 of the factors that goes to whether a context is new, as the  
3 Court knows, is whether we're dealing with a new category of  
4 defendants.

5 And the Court has acknowledged that claims, for example,  
6 against federal agencies or claims against private prison  
7 officials or claims against private individuals are all new  
8 categories of defendants that require -- otherwise require an  
9 expansion of *Bivens*. This is not that. These are claims  
10 against individuals for Fourth Amendment violations that they  
11 were involved in and directly involved in for 30 days in a row  
12 in July of 2020. It is -- it is very much precisely within the  
13 framework of what *Bivens*, I think, recognizes.

14 And I say that *Abbasi* contemplates this because there was  
15 one claim in *Abbasi* that the Supreme Court remanded for  
16 analysis of special factors, and that was the claim against the  
17 warden, and it -- in *Bivens* itself -- you know, *Bivens* -- I'm  
18 sorry -- in *Abbasi* itself, the Supreme Court says, yes, this is  
19 a new context because it's a different constitutional right at  
20 issue.

21 It says, you know, the supervisory liability case law in  
22 the Eighth, Fifteenth -- Eighth, Fifth Amendment prison context  
23 isn't as clear, but it doesn't say that the fact that a warden  
24 is a supervisor necessarily makes that a new context.

25 Here, by contrast, we -- the fact that these are

1 supervisors, as contemplated in *Abbasi*, does not make it a new  
2 context, and we have plenty of precedent, I think, that  
3 established the standard for how these supervisory-level  
4 officers should have -- or what they should have done or what  
5 makes them liable under the Fourth Amendment, when they do --  
6 when they act in the manner that is alleged here, when they  
7 watched the constitutional violations happen.

8 THE COURT: Are you alleging that all use of tear gas  
9 during the period July 1 to July 20 was unlawful?

10 MS. DAHAB: We're alleging that the indiscriminate  
11 use of tear gas was unlawful, to the extent that it was used  
12 indiscriminately against crowds that were not violent.

13 THE COURT: So does that mean all use would be  
14 unlawful because -- I think it's common knowledge that there  
15 were peaceful protesters and then not-so-peaceful protesters  
16 so -- and tear gas spread; so is all of it unlawful, in your  
17 view -- is that part of your claim? -- and that's what the  
18 supervisors knew?

19 MS. DAHAB: To the extent that the -- I mean, our  
20 position is that the --

21 THE COURT: I guess maybe the question is what does  
22 "indiscriminate" mean?

23 MS. DAHAB: Sure. When you -- I guess, when the  
24 officers used tear gas as use of force, and in Your Honor's  
25 example, tear gas, against crowds of individuals, some of whom

1 are nonviolent, some of whom are dispersing pursuant to a  
2 dispersal order and are otherwise -- and against whom even the  
3 use of tear gas would be unlawful or unreasonable, that's  
4 indiscriminate. Right? The officers have to act in a  
5 particular -- particularized way, and they have to do so with a  
6 warning to protesters.

7 So I think that the use of tear gas here, without a  
8 warning to all protesters no matter how they were acting, was  
9 unlawful.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. I interrupted you. Go  
11 ahead.

12 MS. DAHAB: No, it's okay.

13 I was talking about *Abbasi*. I think that the upshot of  
14 what I was trying to say is that the fact that these were  
15 supervisors does not make this a new *Bivens* context. And that,  
16 I think, is directly contemplated by the fact that the Supreme  
17 Court did not shut down the supervisory liability claim against  
18 the warden in *Abbasi* itself.

19 All of the other -- I don't want to repeat all the factors  
20 for the Court that we, I think, sufficiently set forth in our  
21 briefing; but in our view, these officers are not so high level  
22 as, perhaps, Wolf and Cuccinelli were, such that they would --  
23 they would categorically become a new context, and they were on  
24 the ground. Many of them were in the courthouse. Many of them  
25 were watching on a live feed video day in and day out for 30



1 days as these constitutional violations happened.

2 The fact that -- again, the fact that they're supervisors  
3 doesn't make this automatically a new context. And in  
4 plaintiffs' view, none of the other factors that the Supreme  
5 Court has articulated that might otherwise give rise to a new  
6 context under *Bivens*, does not do so here.

7 I don't know if it -- I want to be as helpful for the  
8 Court as possible and, like I said, not repeat our briefs, but  
9 the special factors analysis, I think, you know, even if the  
10 Court were to find that this would be a new context under  
11 *Bivens*, if it -- if it is not a new context, obviously the  
12 inquiry stops there. If you were to find that it is, we also  
13 don't think that special factors counsel against the  
14 expansion -- you know, we're not challenging, as we have -- as  
15 I have described, we're not challenging high-level policy  
16 decisions here. We're challenging the direct participation of  
17 the supervisory officers as they watched the constitutional  
18 violations occur every day in July.

19 THE COURT: Aren't you challenging the use of tear  
20 gas to disperse crowds -- a policy?

21 MS. DAHAB: Well, that -- that was -- we are  
22 challenging the officers' decisions here to use excessive force  
23 against protesters. Some of that was a policy decision that  
24 was made. We are not challenging that policy decision. We're  
25 challenging the decisions that the officers made on the ground

1 and the force that they used in particular cases against  
2 individuals.

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 MS. DAHAB: So I want to make that very clear. If  
5 there were policies in place here, we do not challenge those  
6 policies. We're not challenging executive order or any  
7 other -- or any of the other policies that may have existed to  
8 implement the executive order. I don't know if we know what  
9 those are because we haven't gotten discovery yet, but we are  
10 challenging the individual decision that the officers made on  
11 the ground to control, for crowd control purposes, on the  
12 nights in question.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. DAHAB: Okay. The other special factors, in our  
15 view, don't -- again, don't counsel hesitation toward  
16 expansion. If the Court finds this is a new context, there  
17 really is no other remedy here. Our injunctive relief has  
18 already been dismissed. I don't think there's an APA claim,  
19 although the defendants seem to bring that up several times,  
20 and the FTCA the Court has already -- the Supreme Court has  
21 already held that is not a factor that counsels against  
22 expansion.

23 All the workability concerns about this being a class  
24 action or these being motive-based claims, which they are not,  
25 are also not relevant factors.

1 I think, at bottom, these are Fourth Amendment claims, and  
2 the Supreme Court has already contemplated that even in the  
3 supervisory capacity they're still Fourth Amendment claims that  
4 can fall within the original context that *Bivens* existed to  
5 provide.

6 I will stop there and not address qualified immunity  
7 unless this Court has particular questions on that piece.

8 THE COURT: No, I don't.

9 Let me just ask: Would you have an APA claim if your  
10 challenge was to the policy of using tear gas?

11 MS. DAHAB: If there was a policy in place, that  
12 would -- I suppose a policy would be a final agency action. So  
13 there may be an APA claim against a policy. We are not  
14 challenging any policy in that regard.

15 THE COURT: Understood. Thank you, Ms. Dahab.

16 Why don't I hear from Mr. Greene.

17 MR. GREENE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll do my best  
18 to not repeat the -- what we have argued or repeat much; so I  
19 guess I should lead -- I'm assuming the Court can hear me?

20 THE COURT: Yes, I can hear you.

21 MR. GREENE: I'll just lead with our -- the  
22 inclination of our clients -- Defendants Burger, Cline, Jones,  
23 Morgan, Russell, and Smith -- is that the Court is correct to  
24 be inclined to dismiss the claims against them because we  
25 believe that in the same -- for the same reasons that the Court

1 found there was a new context with respect to the claims  
2 against Defendants Wolf and Cuccinelli, we believe the new  
3 context that's presented here is the exact same context, and we  
4 believe that the same reasons that the Court found to counsel  
5 against a remedy are applicable here.

6 We noted five reasons why a new context is presented.  
7 There were two that the Court cited in Clark: The rank of the  
8 defendants and the specificity of the alleged conduct. Counsel  
9 noted that they alleged the identities and roles with respect  
10 to what happened or with respect to Operation Diligent Valor in  
11 that the response to crowds had to be individualized, but the  
12 Supreme Court has recognized that legal allegations and  
13 liability must also be individualized, and that is not present  
14 in this complaint.

15 The Court has already, in the claims against  
16 Defendants Wolf and Cuccinelli, declined to attribute the  
17 multitude of allegations that cite defendants generally, and  
18 supervisory defendants declined to attribute those to Wolf or  
19 Cuccinelli, and those should not be attributed to these  
20 defendants.

21 And when those allegations are removed, what you have are,  
22 by my count, four allegations that name any of these defendants  
23 specifically. Defendants Burger and Cline -- there's nothing  
24 alleged beyond the titles that they held and the  
25 responsibilities of their former government positions, and

1 there's an allegation that Defendant Cline stood next to  
2 Chad Wolf at a press conference. There's an allegation with  
3 respect to Defendant Morgan that he made statements about  
4 officers lead in Portland, which isn't really a constitutional  
5 violation, as far as I can tell.

6 And what is left are allegations -- an allegation  
7 involving Defendants Russell, Smith, and Jones about their  
8 presence at an incident command post, but there's no allegation  
9 that they observed any particular misconduct directed at any of  
10 the specific plaintiffs. And in that regard, I think reliance  
11 upon cases like *Chavez* or cases -- or a case like *Chavez* or  
12 *Starr* is misplaced.

13 In *Chavez* the Court -- which was a *Bivens* case -- the  
14 Court addressed supervisory liability or alleged -- attempted  
15 to hold supervisors liable for unconstitutional traffic  
16 stops -- allegedly unconstitutional immigration traffic --  
17 immigration-related traffic stops, and the Court specifically  
18 found that the only supervisor that could be held liable, where  
19 an allegation was sufficient to potentially hold them liable,  
20 was a supervisor who was alleged to have actually stopped  
21 traffic. He actually stopped cars. He wasn't -- the Court  
22 found that an allegation that was based -- that tried to hold  
23 the commissioner of the agency liable based on his title, that  
24 that wasn't sufficient. I know it wasn't sufficient to allege  
25 that someone was liable because they had authority over

1 operations, and it wasn't sufficient to hold someone liable  
2 because they had received complaints about unlawful conduct.

3 The only -- the only supervisor held liable was someone  
4 who actually participated in the conduct directed at a specific  
5 plaintiff, and those allegations are not present here,  
6 Your Honor.

7 In terms of the knowledge and acquiescence, there are no  
8 *Bivens* cases that had -- that a Supreme Court in these cases,  
9 in which knowledge and acquiescence, has been sufficient,  
10 certainly not in the Fourth Amendment context to hold  
11 liability.

12 In *Carlson* the Court found awareness of a medical  
13 condition, coupled with the fact that the person was in custody  
14 and there was a duty to -- there was a duty to address that  
15 medical condition, that specifically found liability. But just  
16 general knowledge of wrongdoing being done by others or  
17 subordinates was not sufficient to establish liability.

18 In terms of the argument that these -- these defendants  
19 are in a different situation or different place, in terms of  
20 the policy allegations, that's not really -- that's  
21 contradicted by the nature of the allegations in plaintiffs'  
22 complaint.

23 In plaintiffs' complaint, they specifically say that --  
24 they admit the policy-based nature of their -- of their -- of  
25 *Bivens* claims. In paragraph 134 they allege that the

1 supervisory defendants -- the quote/unquote "supervisory  
2 defendants" -- adopted and implemented a policy -- adopted and  
3 implemented a policy of deploying excessive force against  
4 everyone that protested in the vicinity of the Hatfield -- of  
5 the Hatfield Courthouse, and they further say that their  
6 injuries were the moving force. I'm sorry. They say that the  
7 moving force behind their injuries was this policy. So they're  
8 admitting the policy-based nature of their claims and tying  
9 that to -- tying the policy -- a policy or multiple policies to  
10 their -- to their injuries.

11 The claim that they're not --

12 THE COURT: Mr. Greene, which paragraph of the  
13 complaint is that? Can you remind me?

14 MR. GREENE: That was paragraph 134.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. GREENE: Yes. And the next paragraph, in  
17 paragraph 135, they state that their -- that these -- this  
18 policy was the moving force behind their alleged injuries.

19 Moreover, the claim that they're not challenging policy is  
20 contradicted by the nature of their allegations. As I noted  
21 and as we say in our complaint, Your Honor -- I'm sorry -- in  
22 our motion, the entire complaint -- the second amended  
23 complaint contains a handful of allegations that directly  
24 identify any of these six defendants. The claims are premised  
25 upon these defendants' alleged knowledge and direction of

1 unlawful detentions or excessive force by line-level officers  
2 against a subset of protestors that happen to include  
3 plaintiffs.

4 They are challenging decisions that were made with respect  
5 to these officials that purportedly led to the collective  
6 mistreatment of a group of people. And those are, by  
7 definition, claims that challenge the application of a general  
8 policy that affected plaintiffs and others in similar -- that  
9 affected plaintiffs and others in similar ways.

10 That's in contrast to the claims that the Ninth Circuit  
11 recognized in *Reid* as being *Bivens* claims or what *Bivens* claims  
12 are typically -- to address, which are claims against  
13 rank-and-file federal officers for an officer's individualized  
14 mistreatment of a specific plaintiff.

15 In terms of the -- and, moreover, with respect to the new  
16 context inquiry, I think it's -- in a recent Ninth Circuit  
17 en banc opinion -- *Boule* -- the Ninth Circuit found that even  
18 that case, which involved -- involves -- *Boule* is actually  
19 before the Supreme Court now, but the en banc panel of the  
20 Ninth Circuit found that a claim in which an individual alleged  
21 that he was assaulted by a federal officer on his own property,  
22 that that Fourth Amendment claim was a modest extension of  
23 *Bivens* because it involved a CBP officer as opposed to an FBI  
24 agent.

25 So I don't -- I think that based on even Ninth Circuit



1 case law, it's difficult to make the argument that claims that  
2 are challenging, things that happened allegedly over a 30-day  
3 period of time, involving a multitude of defendants and actions  
4 by line-level officers that were supposedly observed or  
5 directed or had knowledge of by the supervisors, that that's  
6 not a new context. I think that is a difficult argument to  
7 make in light of even Ninth Circuit case law, let alone Supreme  
8 Court case law.

9 In terms of the -- the rank of the defendants, it's -- the  
10 specific levels, the ranks of the defendants, these positions,  
11 don't really matter. What matters is that they're not  
12 line-level officers being sued for their specific conduct being  
13 directed towards a specific plaintiff, that therefore they're  
14 being sued under a theory of supervisory liability and the  
15 direct participation arguments are conclusory and are not  
16 sufficient to state a claim against these defendants.

17 So, again, I don't want to repeat our filings too much,  
18 Your Honor. If the Court has other questions, I'm happy to  
19 address them.

20 THE COURT: All right. No. I think I'm satisfied.

21 All right. So I'm going to take this under advisement. I  
22 should have a decision out quickly, but I want to think about  
23 your arguments and look at some of the cases again that you  
24 just mentioned.

25 So that's my current status of that motion.

1           Then let's turn to the motion to compel discovery.

2           It seems like the government has provided a number of  
3 incident reports that they complied with. I believe they have  
4 complied with the order that I previously issued when we had  
5 our last hearing just about identities of officers who were  
6 involved during the period of time alleged in the complaint  
7 involved in use-of-force incidents. At that time there wasn't  
8 a request for specific incident reports, but I understand  
9 that -- or there may have been a request. I didn't order that,  
10 but I know the government has provided some of those incident  
11 reports.

12           MS. DAHAB: No. Now, we've -- well, we have received  
13 from the government a list of names only. They have not  
14 produced any incident reports to us.

15           THE COURT: All right. So you can advise me -- I'll  
16 hear probably, Ms. Dahab, what you have and haven't had and  
17 what you're looking for. Let me tell you what my inclination  
18 is and then you can tell me if I'm right or wrong.

19           Again, while I'm deciding the supervisory agent motion to  
20 dismiss, I don't believe at this stage you're entitled to a  
21 30(b)(6) deposition. So my inclination is that I would -- I  
22 don't know if it's in the status of asking for an order about  
23 that, but I would not compel those depositions is my  
24 inclination.

25           My inclination is that you're entitled only to incident

1 reports regarding the specific incidents not involving tear  
2 gas, but the other munitions that are alleged in the complaint  
3 with regard to your named plaintiffs, and -- rather than every  
4 night of tear gas because at this point it's not clear to me  
5 that the tear gas class survives under *Bivens*. So I'm going to  
6 give you limited discovery.

7 Again, I haven't -- that issue hasn't been teed up for me,  
8 but I think it's within my discretion and appropriate for you  
9 to try to determine not just the identity of officers who were  
10 on but officers that were on for that specific -- incident  
11 reports related to the specific time period of the specific  
12 plaintiff with the allegation that is in the complaint.

13 So, for example, Plaintiff Maher states that on July 22nd,  
14 between approximately 12:30 and 1:00 a.m., a federal agent  
15 wearing camouflage -- he beat her with a baton when she was  
16 walking away. I would -- my inclination is you get that  
17 incident report or incident reports that could be -- or from  
18 that time period regarding use of force.

19 And, similarly, there's another one from 2:00 to 3:00 a.m.  
20 Struck in the head by a munition.

21 So it has to be very specific. Again, I'm just telling  
22 you my inclination, and I'll hear from you both, but very  
23 specific -- only with regard to the specific allegations.  
24 Again, that's where the individual complained -- plaintiffs say  
25 they were targeted specifically. Not the broad "I took in tear

1 gas that was being sprayed." That's why -- that's too broad at  
2 this stage, but -- so at this stage I'll allow just the  
3 specific incidents that are given up with non-tear gas, unless  
4 there was "tear gas sprayed in my face purposely on a  
5 particular date and time," which I don't think that is in the  
6 complaint; but if it is, it's specific targeting.

7 So, first, let me ask Mr. Clendenen. Is what I have  
8 just -- again, I'm just saying it's my inclination. I'll let  
9 you argue, but would that be a clear order from me that the  
10 government could comply with?

11 MR. CLENDENEN: Your Honor, I think it's clear  
12 enough. I think so. I'm hesitant just to say it's definitely  
13 because we don't -- I haven't discussed with agencies whether  
14 or not there's an easy way to, you know, cleave off the tear  
15 gas use versus other uses of force. It should be. The  
16 use-of-force reports, I believe, should indicate what sorts of  
17 munitions were used, at least in most cases; but I think it's  
18 at least possible to comply with that.

19 THE COURT: And let me say the underpinning of my  
20 inclination is, I think, plaintiffs should be able to get --  
21 it's insufficient simply to -- and I realize that, really,  
22 probably my giving plaintiffs just the identity of all officers  
23 previously doesn't really get to the identity of the officer  
24 involved in the alleged behavior, and there -- it seems to me  
25 that the only specific alleged behavior that one could

1 accomplish getting to the identity of that officer and then,  
2 obviously, you know, it gets litigated on whether there was a  
3 motion to dismiss or -- but at least to identify the officer  
4 involved in the incident regarding Plaintiff Maher, for  
5 example, is to look at incident reports regarding use of force  
6 that -- regarding batons, you know, regarding the specifics of  
7 what that plaintiff alleges at the time period and place that  
8 plaintiff alleges it. And if it's not sufficiently specific,  
9 they don't get it.

10 But I think they're entitled and it's within the Court's  
11 discretion to afford them that limited discovery because  
12 identity of officers generally is not helpful. What they need  
13 is officers engaged in the specific conduct that they have  
14 alleged is violative of their rights.

15 MR. CLENDENEN: That's understood, Your Honor. Yes.

16 THE COURT: So I haven't walked through those  
17 specifics. And my order, I think, is going to be broader than  
18 that; but, if necessary -- I don't think it should be disputed.  
19 Either they gave enough specificity that it is -- you know,  
20 general time, date -- not the whole summer, but general time,  
21 date, and what happened, that the government could match up  
22 reports that would potentially get, from that specific  
23 information, incident reports that -- again, I'm not saying  
24 they can't be redacted if there is information that should not  
25 be conveyed, but they're -- I think they're deserving to get

1 the identity of the officer involved in the incident that  
2 they're complaining happened, and I don't know how else to  
3 accomplish that and move this case forward without that  
4 information.

5 So why don't I hear first -- but I just wanted to make  
6 sure that was clear, Mr. Clendenen, before I hear from  
7 Ms. Dahab why she should get the rest of the information that  
8 they seek.

9 MS. DAHAB: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 I think that what you have just articulated is certainly  
11 within the scope of information that we seek, and I think in  
12 our motion we tried to ask for the names of particular officers  
13 and the method of force used at specific locations against the  
14 plaintiff. So I think that is consistent, at least in part  
15 with what we -- what we ask for. I want to make clear -- and  
16 maybe I made this -- we talked about this a little bit in the  
17 argument on the motion to dismiss. I apologize if I'm  
18 restating our position on this. I just want to make sure that  
19 I've stated clearly our position on this tear gas issue and  
20 what conduct by the federal officers, in plaintiffs' view, is  
21 violative of their rights with respect to tear gas.

22 It's plaintiffs' position that if there's a nonviolent  
23 protester in a crowd or if there's nonviolent protesters in a  
24 crowd of violent protesters, that use of tear gas against all  
25 the protestors violates the rights -- is an excessive use of

1 force because the use of tear gas, just like the use of the  
2 other munitions that we describe in the complaint, has to be  
3 individualized. It has to be specifically, you know, targeted  
4 based on the conduct of the person being targeted.

5 So I think that's consistent with the case law. I just  
6 want to make that very clear, to the extent that I didn't  
7 before.

8 Just, obviously, in our view, the use of tear gas against  
9 these plaintiffs, as well, violated the Constitution, and so we  
10 should be entitled to those -- to those reports as well and the  
11 information pertaining to the identity of the officer and the  
12 location of the use as to our particular plaintiffs.

13 So that is the basis of our request on that -- on that  
14 issue.

15 THE COURT: And the reason I'm not -- I understand  
16 that's a basis of your claim; and, again, I see the tear gas  
17 class as quite different from the -- what you call, I think,  
18 the shooting class.

19 MS. DAHAB: Uh-huh.

20 THE COURT: I think those are quite different.

21 And, again, we're not here to litigate that issue now.

22 MS. DAHAB: Right.

23 THE COURT: But it seems to me at this stage, before  
24 anyone has been served, when you're not entitled and officers  
25 haven't been able to challenge either -- move to dismiss on any

1 basis, including qualified immunity, that it is overly  
2 burdensome to request incident reports involving tear gas,  
3 which appears to have been used every night.

4 So that means an incident -- and I don't know. I'm not  
5 sure what the practice is of the agencies or multiple agencies  
6 involved in tear gas or not. I'm just not familiar with the  
7 policy. But it seemed to me that that is too much of a burden  
8 at this stage in the proceedings, and so I'm trying to limit, I  
9 think, something that is your -- you should be entitled to the  
10 specific instances.

11 So that's why I have at this stage -- and I'm not saying  
12 you would never get it. I'm just -- at this stage, I think  
13 this will get the case moving, hopefully.

14 Ms. Dahab, go ahead.

15 MS. DAHAB: Well, I don't mean to interrupt  
16 Your Honor.

17 I want to, I guess -- I guess, make -- I guess, flag two  
18 things. The first is that I don't think the government is  
19 arguing that the provision of the tear gas information is  
20 unduly burdensome. I certainly understand they're arguing that  
21 depositions would be such, and I under -- you know, I  
22 understand Your Honor's decision on that piece. If the tear  
23 gas information is part of the incident report, it strikes me  
24 that it may not be unduly burdensome for them to produce that  
25 information and may be more burdensome for them to redact it.



1 THE COURT: Understood. And I'm not saying to  
2 exclude tear gas. I'm just trying to home in on the specific  
3 incidents that you've alleged.

4 MS. DAHAB: Yeah. Yeah. Sure. Okay.

5 THE COURT: I think the allegation regarding  
6 indiscriminate use of tear gas is quite broad at this stage; so  
7 I'm trying to balance the competing interests of what is  
8 appropriate to ask the government to produce at this stage when  
9 people haven't been served yet. We're just -- you're just  
10 trying -- and your claim was --

11 MS. DAHAB: Sure.

12 THE COURT: You just wanted to identify the officers,  
13 and now you have all the names of officers who were involved in  
14 the incidents, but you don't have it narrowed down for the  
15 specific claims involving your named plaintiffs.

16 So that's what I'm trying to help move forward.

17 MS. DAHAB: Sure. Yeah. And we appreciate that.  
18 We, likewise, would like this to move forward. So I think this  
19 information will help.

20 The other thing that will help and the other thing we have  
21 asked for in the motion to compel is service addresses for  
22 these individuals, which we also don't have. And service, as  
23 Your Honor knows in this case, has been very difficult,  
24 primarily because we're dealing with agencies that are not  
25 fully operational because it's a -- because of the pandemic,

1 and so we aren't able to complete service inside buildings.

2 I think the Department of Justice has made clear that, at  
3 least in this circumstance, that they're not -- they have not  
4 been able to accept service. I don't know if that has changed,  
5 but if it has not changed, we would also ask the Court to  
6 order -- to order the government to provide service addresses  
7 so that we can continue to move this forward.

8 THE COURT: All right. So let me -- Mr. Clendenen,  
9 so assuming that that is -- the order I issue is as I  
10 described, what -- how do you -- first of all, would the  
11 government be -- is there any objection to providing service  
12 addresses or accepting service, to the extent officers can be  
13 identified that are consistent with the allegations that  
14 plaintiff -- named plaintiffs are making in the complaint?

15 MR. CLENDENEN: So, Your Honor, to start with,  
16 accepting service -- the Department of Justice itself, like  
17 myself, we can't accept service on behalf of individual  
18 defendants. In some instances, including, I believe, for some  
19 of the defendants who are in this case, there are attorneys who  
20 are assigned to represent individual defendants, such as  
21 Mr. Greene, and they can, if authorized by their client, accept  
22 service on behalf of those defendants. That would be the only  
23 instance in which the DOJ could accept service, and that could  
24 happen here.

25 I think to the more general point about whether we object

1 to turn over service addresses, we would object -- it doesn't  
2 seem appropriate before the defendants have even been named.  
3 It seems as though the more appropriate sequence of events  
4 would be for the plaintiff to name the defendants in the  
5 complaint. Potentially, they'll have a representative assigned  
6 to them quite quickly, and the representative can accept  
7 process, or maybe the plaintiff can serve them in some other  
8 way. And if after a certain period of time they have exhausted  
9 all -- all means, then they can make a motion for service  
10 addresses.

11 But the point of the early discovery is just to identify  
12 the defendants. So the service addresses is a whole separate  
13 issue that doesn't need to happen at this point.

14 THE COURT: Ms. Dahab?

15 MS. DAHAB: I think -- I'm worried that we're  
16 speaking past each other. We have named several -- we have  
17 named many of these supervisory- and patrol-level officers  
18 under pseudonyms, at the Court's direction, but have been  
19 unable to serve them because -- for the reasons I have  
20 described before.

21 So those are also the service addresses that we're looking  
22 for because we have not yet been able to complete service on  
23 those individuals.

24 MR. CLENDENEN: Your Honor, I didn't quite understand  
25 plaintiffs to be seeking the service addresses of the

1 already-named defendants. I thought they were asking for  
2 service addresses just with regards to the -- you know, the new  
3 identities that would come through the follow-on discovery.

4 With regards to the already-named defendants, I would say  
5 that the plaintiffs should submit a separate motion and explain  
6 what efforts they have made to serve those defendants already,  
7 and in that they can ask for service addresses, and then we can  
8 respond appropriately.

9 THE COURT: All right. And I assume, Ms. Dahab,  
10 you're referring to the FPS supervisory officers numbers 2, 6,  
11 8, 14, et cetera? Is that what you're referring to?

12 MS. DAHAB: All of those, yes. Yes. There's many of  
13 them.

14 THE COURT: And then some by initials and then others  
15 by number. Okay.

16 MS. DAHAB: And, I mean, we can certainly prepare a  
17 separate motion, Your Honor. I think the service issue is  
18 really the main thing that is slowing this case down, and so to  
19 the extent that we're seeking to move it forward, you know,  
20 I -- if the Court would be willing to construe this motion to  
21 also encompass -- that's certainly what it was intended to  
22 encompass -- those service addresses as well -- because of the  
23 reasons that we have articulated in several prior motions of  
24 our difficulties in completing service on these defendants.

25 THE COURT: All right. Let me ask, Mr. Clendenen --

1 why don't I have you all confer on -- it sounds like you're not  
2 disputing that at some point, after sufficient effort on  
3 plaintiffs' part, they could be entitled to get the service  
4 addresses. Why don't you confer and find out what steps  
5 plaintiffs have taken with regard to the named officers.

6 I think your point is well taken on you having to -- the  
7 Doe defendants are not yet named and -- or at least the ones --  
8 I'm sorry -- the supervisory- and patrol-level defendants  
9 1 through 140 are not named. So your point is, I think,  
10 correct that, you know, they need to be named first. And,  
11 again, I'm still having, at this stage of the proceeding, based  
12 on our -- I think it was our very first hearing -- that they  
13 would be identified by number or some other pseudonym rather  
14 than actually having their names on the complaint because it  
15 was established that there was a security risk.

16 So it would be helpful, if it hadn't happened, that you  
17 have a conferral with Ms. Dahab and see if there's some way to  
18 more easily effect service. I don't want to have them  
19 identified by name. And that does pose, I would assume,  
20 additional challenges for plaintiffs with regard to service. I  
21 mean, if it doesn't, then I'm wrong on that, but if -- I'm  
22 trying to both protect the officers' identities, at this stage,  
23 until we know that they are viable participants in this lawsuit  
24 and -- but also speed things up.

25 So I'm not going to order right now that the government

1 provide the service addresses, but that is something I would be  
2 inclined to do if a lot of effort has been made by the  
3 plaintiffs. So knowing that, hopefully you can confer and come  
4 to an agreement without having to come back to me for that, or  
5 get permission to accept service. However they would prefer to  
6 do it.

7 So the only order I'm making is conferral on the issue of  
8 providing service addresses for the named individuals in the  
9 complaint -- in the second amended complaint.

10 All right. Any other questions, Ms. Dahab?

11 MS. DAHAB: I don't think so, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Clendenen, any additional issues with  
13 regard to the discovery?

14 MR. CLENDENEN: No, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: All right. So I'll stick with, then, my  
16 inclination. My order is that the government should provide  
17 incident reports that are directly tied to the specific  
18 incidents alleged only by the named plaintiffs with regard to  
19 instances where they were -- they allege they were specifically  
20 targeted. So there's some where the named plaintiffs -- again  
21 I'm going back to tear gas -- they were affected by tear gas,  
22 but it doesn't allege that they were specifically targeted, and  
23 so I'm not requiring those to be turned over. Just where they  
24 allege they were specifically targeted at a certain time and  
25 place and that -- for the most part, those appear to be

1 non-tear-gas incidents, based on my memory of the complaint.

2 All right. So let's -- maybe we've talked, actually,  
3 about the status of the case now with regard to these other  
4 parties.

5 What is the status of serving any of these others,  
6 Ms. Dahab? Has anybody else been formally served?

7 MS. DAHAB: I should have pulled this before I came  
8 into this hearing. I apologize that I didn't. I think that we  
9 have had -- we named one other person by name, and I think we  
10 were able to complete service on Leonard Eric Patterson.

11 The other -- the other pseudonymed defendants we have not,  
12 to my knowledge. I need to double-check. We have sent process  
13 servers out several times but have not been able to complete  
14 service on them.

15 THE COURT: And then with regard -- I note that you  
16 had -- who -- so Leonard Eric Patterson is -- what role is that  
17 person?

18 MS. DAHAB: This is in paragraph 31 of our complaint.  
19 Director of the Federal Protective Service.

20 THE COURT: Okay. And I note Donald Washington was  
21 head of the U.S. Marshals Service.

22 So you're still --

23 MS. DAHAB: I'm sorry. I think the folks that we  
24 have identified by name we were able to complete service on  
25 them. I -- with the -- with one -- I think there was one

1 exception. I apologize I don't have all the detailed  
2 information for the Court this morning.

3 Most of the pseudonymed defendants we have not, but a few  
4 of the named ones we have.

5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Greene, do you know if  
6 those -- is DOJ representing some of those supervised -- they  
7 were high-level supervisory personnel that ran the agencies.  
8 Is that -- have they answered, or do you -- anything you can  
9 tell me about the status?

10 MR. GREENE: At this point, Your Honor, we -- I am  
11 only representing the defendants that we filed motions on  
12 behalf of. I don't represent anyone other than the folks  
13 that -- the six defendants before the Court today and  
14 Defendants Cuccinelli and Wolf.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. GREENE: I believe that other defendants have  
17 submitted requests for representation, and they may still be  
18 being processed.

19 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you.

20 All right. Is there anything else, from plaintiffs'  
21 perspective, that you think I need to take up today?

22 MS. DAHAB: I don't think so, Your Honor. We  
23 submitted -- we had a Rule 26 conference with Mr. Greene and  
24 submitted a report. So I think the discovery that we seek  
25 there really -- I think that the dispute there centers on the



1 resolution of the motion to dismiss that we just argued and any  
2 discovery we might get in the meantime; but other than that, I  
3 can't think of anything else.

4 THE COURT: All right. I'll ask you the same  
5 question, Mr. Greene and Mr. Clendenen. I did have a question,  
6 because I know that there are a number of other cases,  
7 including ones assigned to me, that are very similar and even  
8 some -- I note there are cases or paragraphs in this complaint  
9 that are actually cases that -- those people brought their own  
10 cases independently; so I assume they are not members of the  
11 class here, such as Mr. LaBella. I know another judge has that  
12 case. I have the Protest Medic cases and a lot of them are  
13 named here, but it seemed to me -- and I'm just trying to find  
14 the cases -- whether there is -- somehow whether it makes  
15 sense -- and, obviously, I don't have all of those. There's  
16 not necessarily complete overlap, but I think there's a large  
17 overlap of the lawyers. Ms. Dahab and I -- let's see. I  
18 have -- Kristiansen, Cohen, Mead, Haberman-Ducey,  
19 Jessie-Uyanik, and Ketcher are all excessive force cases. Is  
20 there -- I want to make sure we're really using judicial  
21 resources efficiently here.

22 MS. DAHAB: Sure.

23 THE COURT: And is there -- and not repeating the  
24 same motions in every case, and it looks like the defendants  
25 are largely the same. Is there -- have you talked about --

1 with the government about whether there's a way at least to  
2 consolidate, for purposes of discovery or motions, so that we  
3 don't waste everybody's time?

4 MS. DAHAB: Sure. I think, with the Court's  
5 permission, I'm inclined to defer to Mr. Park or Ms. Burrows on  
6 this. I'm not -- I'm not counsel of record on those Individual  
7 cases. I know they have had conversations with the government  
8 about potentially consolidating some of those cases.

9 And we, of course, would be fine with consolidating for  
10 the purposes of discovery with the class case.

11 THE COURT: Mr. Park or Ms. Burrows, any input you  
12 want to give on that?

13 MR. PARK: Dave Park, Your Honor. The individual  
14 cases have been consolidated for purposes of motions to  
15 dismiss. The individual cases should not be -- well, they  
16 might have certain common aspects of discovery, but each are  
17 discrete, separate incidents on separate dates, involving  
18 different officers, different people, different supervisors.  
19 It would make no sense to really consolidate those for  
20 discovery.

21 THE COURT: So in those cases you are not going to be  
22 seeking the broader information about the -- everything going  
23 on during the time period?

24 MR. PARK: Those cases are specific serious injury  
25 cases, Your Honor. We're focusing on the officers that are

1 directly involved in inflicting the harm.

2 THE COURT: All right. Understood.

3 What about -- Mr. Greene, I don't know if this -- are you  
4 on each of these cases also?

5 MR. GREENE: Yes, Your Honor. As it so happens, I am  
6 on those cases. Those cases involve the same six defendants  
7 who are on the motion to dismiss here, and the Department is  
8 representing everyone except for Mr. Smith, I believe, who I  
9 believe is represented by private counsel. There's one  
10 defendant who is represented by private counsel.

11 But we had filed a motion to dismiss on behalf of the  
12 defendants we represent, and the other defendant, I believe,  
13 filed a motion as well; so that -- that is, I believe,  
14 currently before the Court awaiting a response from plaintiffs.

15 THE COURT: All right. From your perspective,  
16 Mr. Greene, is there some way that I can manage these more  
17 efficiently or that you can manage them more efficiently by  
18 combining any of the aspects of the case, or is it, as Mr. Park  
19 says, not really helpful?

20 MR. GREENE: Well, I know that we have already taken  
21 steps to make this more efficient by moving -- we asked for a  
22 consolidation for the motions with respect to these high-level  
23 supervisors because the allegations against them are all  
24 substantially similar throughout the cases. So that is  
25 efficient from that perspective.

1           With respect to the allegations involving specific  
2 incidents and what line-level officers were involved, I guess I  
3 would have to defer to Mr. Park on that. It would seem to me  
4 that you could do discovery -- if you are alleging different  
5 incidents on different days, maybe you can't really do -- if  
6 you're focusing on those sole incidents, maybe you can't do a  
7 consolidated discovery on that if you are just looking at  
8 discrete incidents, but -- but maybe you can. I'm not sure.

9           But certainly with respect to the high-level supervisors  
10 that have been sued, we -- we are -- we have consolidated and  
11 we've moved on behalf of all of those in one motion because the  
12 allegations against them are substantially similar to the  
13 allegations before the Court today in this case.

14           THE COURT: All right. So I appreciate that. If  
15 there is -- so I won't do anything about it today. It's  
16 just -- if either I find or you find that it is more efficient  
17 to combine some of the aspects of the cases, you know,  
18 certainly I would like to come up with the most efficient way  
19 to do it. So keep that in mind as you move forward.

20           And if I'm seeing the same motions in every single case  
21 boilerplate, then I think I would prefer to do it as one, even  
22 though -- understanding that they are -- might have some  
23 different claims that would warrant a different result. It  
24 doesn't always have to be all exactly the same.

25           Mr. Clendenen, I did not ask you whether you weigh in on

1 this. I know you're involved in some of the discovery issues.  
2 Is there anything you wanted to say about consolidating some of  
3 the cases?

4 MR. CLENDENEN: Your Honor, I don't really have  
5 anything to add. With the exception of the Clark case, I'm  
6 only involved in the cases that have claims for injunctive  
7 relief. So the ones that you listed, I don't have any  
8 oversight over it, at least at this time.

9 THE COURT: All right. Understood.

10 All right. So, Mr. Greene, is there anything else you  
11 wanted -- you think I need to address today?

12 MR. GREENE: No, Your Honor. Thank you for your  
13 time.

14 THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Clendenen, anything  
15 from you?

16 MR. CLENDENEN: No, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: And, Ms. Dahab, I already asked you, but  
18 last word? No?

19 MS. DAHAB: Nothing further from us. Thank you,  
20 Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everybody. We'll  
22 be in recess, and I hope to have a decision out to you quickly.

23 And we'll do a minute order just regarding the discovery.  
24 Thank you so much.

25 MS. DAHAB: Great. Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. CLENDENEN: Thank you.

MR. GREENE: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Hearing concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

Angelica Clark, et al. v. Chad Wolf, et al.

3:20-cv-01436-IM

Telephonic Status Conference

January 12, 2022

I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the telephonic proceedings heard via conference call, taken by stenographic means. Due to the telephonic connection, parties appearing via speakerphone or cell phone or wearing masks due to coronavirus, speakers overlapping when speaking, speakers not identifying themselves before they speak, fast speakers, the speaker's failure to enunciate, and/or other technical difficulties that occur during telephonic proceedings, this certification is limited by the above-mentioned reasons and any technological difficulties of such proceedings occurring over the speakerphone at the United States District Court of Oregon in the above-entitled cause.

A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not certified.

/s/Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC

Official Court Reporter  
Oregon CSR No. 98-0346

Signature Date: 1/26/2022  
CSR Expiration Date: 9/30/2023